1	Larry A. Hammond, 004049	ANZ ANZ
2	Anne M. Chapman, 025965 OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.	2010 SEP 13 AM 10:
3	2929 N. Central Avenue, 21st Floor	JEANNE HICKS. CLER
4	Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793 (602) 640-9000	BY: B. Chamberlain
5	lhammond@omlaw.com achapman@omlaw.com	
6		
7	John M. Sears, 005617 P.O. Box 4080	
8	Prescott, Arizona 86302	
9	(928) 778-5208 John.Sears@azbar.org	
10	Attorneys for Defendant	
11	Attorneys for Defendant	
12	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI	
13	IN AND FOR THE COC	
14	STATE OF ARIZONA,) No. P1300CR20081339
15	Plaintiff,) Div. 6
16	vs.)) DEFENDANT'S REPLY IN
17		SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
18	STEVEN CARROLL DEMOCKER,) EXTEND TIME FOR) ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE
19	Defendant.) PURSUANT TO 15.6(D)
20		<i>)</i>)
)
21	The Count of sould amount the Defendant?	a Matian to Extand Time for Additional
22	The Court should grant the Defendant's Motion to Extend Time for Additional	
23	Disclosure pursuant to Rule 15.6(d) because the requirements of the Rule have been	
24	met, the State had prior notice of this material disclosed in an alternative format on	
25	September 22, 2009 as WTH00001-54 and because the disclosure of the information in	

this format was made simultaneously to the State and the defense by a previously noticed witness.¹

The State's Objection does not deny that it received the documents disclosed in the Tenth Supplemental Disclosure on the same date as the defense received them from Dr. Curtis James, nor does it deny that it has already interviewed Dr. James. In fact, the State asked Dr. James to provide additional data in its interview of him. Finally, the State does not deny that weather records were previously disclosed by the defense in one format and that the current records simply provide similar data in a different format. This new format for the information was disclosed simultaneously by the previously disclosed witness to both the State and the defense.

The State's response also falsely represents the testimony of Charlotte DeMocker as being that it rained "hours before" the homicide. In fact, what Ms. DeMocker testified and as text records reveal, the rain occurred the day before on July 1.

Q. What were you and your mother texting about?

A. I had just gotten a new job. She asked about how my training was, and she asked about the rain that we had gotten *one day previous*. Transcript June 4, page 39.

Weather records from a weather station right very near Ms. Kennedy's home (approximately one-half mile to the West) and operated by Dr. Curtis James reveal that there was no measurable rain on the date of the homicide. This weather station is registered at KAZPRESC10. Dr. James is a professor of meteorology at Embry Riddle University. Weather records were disclosed to the State on September of 2009, and are simply being provided now in an alterative format, because they were so provided by the previously disclosed witness. The State is correct that this issue has been a longstanding one, with the State being on notice that the defense intended to offer this

¹ The defense's Objection was Federal Expressed to the State on 8/23/10. Pursuant to Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure 1.3a and 16.1, the State's response was due on September 7 and was not timely filed.

witness and records to support the fact that there was no rain in the area on July 1. This evidence is consistent with text messages, the testimony of Charlotte DeMocker, photographs already admitted into evidence and weather records disclosed to the State.

The State also late disclosed weather records from NOAA on August 24, 2010. The State filed a Motion to Extend Time for Additional Disclosure Re the 75th Supplemental Disclosure. The State did not request permission to use these records in its Motion to Extend Time. The defense filed an objection based on the items specifically mention in the State's motion. On September 8, the State filed its Response to the Defense's Objection and mentioned these late disclosed documents for the first time. The State should not be permitted to use these documents in the absence of a proper motion and opportunity for Mr. DeMocker to object.

For this reason, the Court should grant the defense's Motion to Extend Time for Additional Disclosure.

DATED this 13th day of September, 2010.

By:

John M. Sears P.O. Box 4080 Prescott, Arizona 86302

OSBORN MALEDON, P.A. Larry A. Hammond Anne M. Chapman 2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793

Attorneys for Defendant

ORIGINAL of the foregoing hand delivered for filing this 13th day of September, 2010, with:

1	
1	Jeanne Hicks
2	Clerk of the Court
3	Yavapai County Superior Court 120 S. Cortez
	Prescott, AZ 86303
4	
5	COPIES of the foregoing hand delivered this 13 th day of September, 2010, to:
6	
7	The Hon. Warren R. Darrow Judge Pro Tem B
8	120 S. Cortez
9	Prescott, AZ 86303
10	Joseph C. Butner, Esq. Jeffrey Paupore, Esq.
11	Prescott Courthouse basket
12	
13	3289493
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	